



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,409	02/20/2004	Sven Bulow	KLAUS2.005AUS	6350
20995 7590 07/14/2009 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER				
JUNG, UNSU				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1641				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/14/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,409

Applicant(s)

BULOW, SVEN

Examiner

UNSU JUNG

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/6/2009.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendments in the reply filed on April 6, 2009 have been acknowledged and entered. The reply did not include any claim amendments.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1-6 are pending and under consideration for patentability under 37 CFR 1.104.

Priority

3. The instant application has a filing date of February 20, 2004 and does not claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on April 6, 2009 has been considered by the examiner.

Rejections Withdrawn

5. Applicant's arguments, see pp3-4, filed on April 6, 2009, with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kroy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,252,294, Oct. 12, 1993) in view of Barbera-Guillem (U.S. PG Pub. No. US 2002/0172621 A1, Nov. 21, 2002) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The

Art Unit: 1641

rejection of claims 1-3, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kroy et al. in view of Barbera-Guillem and the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kroy in view of Barbera-Guillem (U.S. PG Pub. No. US 2002/0172621 A1, Nov. 21, 2002), and further in view of Mainquist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,534,014, published on Mar. 18, 2003 and filed on May 11, 2000) have been withdrawn.

New Grounds of Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robbins (U.S. Patent No. 5,916,526, June 29, 1999).

Robbins anticipates instant claims by teaching a multi-well container (chamber array arrangement) comprising a rectangular array of tubes in standard multi-well plate tube array format (see entire document, particularly Abstract). The multi-well container of Robbins have tubes (containers) subdivided by partitions (containers having at least two chambers) with circular bottom, which is tapered (Fig.'s 1 and 2), in standard 96-well/microtiter plate format. Each chamber in a tube can contain reagents necessary for

Art Unit: 1641

use in variety of screening assays (column 1, lines 19-28 and column 5, lines 11-18). Such reagents can be stored and removed from the tubes (column 5, lines 11-18), which reads on the feature of the probe carrier essentially freely movable in said particular chamber. Therefore, the tubes of Robbins have a circular bottom having a surface area which is smaller than the bottom surface area of a well of a standard 96 well microtiter plate.

With respect to claim 2, Robbins teaches that the chamber array arrangement further comprises a cover arranged on one or more of said at least two chambers (column 7, lines 60-63).

With respect to claim 5, Robbins teaches that a lid or cover can be placed on the tubes, which necessarily means that the cover of Robbins is a separate entity that can be removed from the chamber array arrangement.

With respect to claim 6, Robbins teaches that the chamber array arrangement further comprises a carrier (plate 16 in Fig. 1) having a location adapted to receive said container (column 4, lines 52-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1641

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robbins (U.S. Patent No. 5,916,526, June 29, 1999) in view of Mainquist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,534,014, published on Mar. 18, 2003 and filed on May 11, 2000) (hereinafter "Mainquist").

Robbins teaches a chamber array arrangement for performing screening assays as set forth above. Although Robbins teaches a cover, which would allow to retain the probe or probe pool essentially completely in the respective chamber, Robbins fails to teach a chamber array arrangement, wherein the cover being a membrane (non-bonding material) having a pore size smaller than the size of the probe carrier with the probe attached or of the free probe.

Mainquist teaches a specimen plate lid (cover) that provides enhanced sealing and provides increased efficiency in placement on a specimen plate or removal from a specimen plate (see entire document, particularly column 2, lines 10-14). It is known to provide a lid to cover a specimen plate (column 1, lines 44-55). For example, the samples in the wells may need to incubate or it may be desired to store the samples for

Art Unit: 1641

an extended period of time (column 1, lines 44-49). By covering the wells, contamination and evaporation may be reduced (column 1, lines 44-49). It is an advantage of specimen plate lid that it can be accurately and relatively efficiently positioned on a specimen plate (column 2, lines 52-54). Since the lid and its compressible seal alone provide a good barrier between the specimen plate wells and the outside environment, additional mechanical and adhesive sealing is not required (cover made from a non-bonding material, column 2, lines 54-57). The specimen plate lid is well suited for handling by a robotic material handling system. Since the lid is self-sealing with specimen plate, operator intervention is not required to mechanically seal the plate (column 2, lines 65-67). With respect to claim 4, Mainquist teaches a membrane cover having an adjustable permeability (a pore size, column 7, lines 49-54).

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a cover of Mainquist on the chamber array arrangement of Robbins in order to prevent contamination and evaporation in the wells of the chamber array arrangement.

The advantage of a chamber array arrangement cover comprising a non-bonding material, which can be accurately and relatively efficiently positioned on the chamber array arrangement without additional mechanical and adhesive sealing, provides the motivation to employ a cover of Mainquist on the chamber array arrangement of Robbins with a reasonable expectation of success since the cover of Mainquist can be used for chamber array arrangement in multi-well plate format. Further, Mainquist also teaches that the cover provides a good barrier between the specimen plate wells and

Art Unit: 1641

the outside environment (column 2, lines 54-57) to reduce contamination and evaporation (column 1, lines 44-49). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would recognize that the permeability (pore size) of the membrane cover of Robbins in view of Mainquist would intrinsically have a size smaller than the size of the probe carrier contained in the chambers of the chamber array arrangement since the membrane cover serves as a barrier between specimen plate wells/chambers in order to reduce contamination and evaporation.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's request to consider U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/783,415 (U.S. Patent No. 7,219,800) has been fully acknowledged. U.S. Patent No. 7,219,800 has been considered and cited in the PTO-982 form in the current Office Action.

Since the prior art fulfills all the limitations currently recited in the claims, the invention as currently recited would read upon the prior art.

Conclusion

12. No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1641

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to UNSU JUNG whose telephone number is (571)272-8506. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Shibuya can be reached on 571-272-0806. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Unsu Jung/
Unsu Jung
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641